





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viriginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/050,016	01/15/2002	Dalton Swain Conselvan	539-013-2 5511	
4955	7590 08/16/2004		EXAMINER	
	ESSOLA VAN DER SLI	PATEL, NITIN		
ADOLPHSC BRADFORI	O GREEN BUILDING 5	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224 MONROE, CT 06468			2673	
			DATE MAILED: 08/16/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application	on No.	Applicant(s)			
1						
Office Action Summary	10/050,01		CONSELVAN, DALTON SWAIN			
omce Action Gammary	Examiner		Art Unit			
Th. MAN WO DATE 4.4	Nitin Pate		2673			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUI - Extensions of time may be available under the provisio after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this cor - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for rep Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NICATION. ns of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no even munication. (30) days, a reply within the statustatutory period will apply and will live will, by statute, cause the apply.	ent, however, may a reply be tim utory minimum of thirty (30) days il expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ication to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) fi	led on M. January 200	1				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL .	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 January 2004</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
<u> </u>	3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims	,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
·						
4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected	to by the Examiner. No	te the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 of Paper No(s)/Mail Date	or PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal Pa				

Art Unit: 2673

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US2002/0180762 A1) in view of in view of Lim et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,067,355).

As per claims 1,4 Lee shows a portable telephone (a hardware) liquid crystal display (element 130 In fig.1) screen and software in a micro controller (in fig.1 element 100) that enables the vertical inversion of characters (In fig.2) in response to an external button 9element 110 In fig.1); an external sensor (In Fig.1 element 140); an external button connected to the micro controller and adapted to activate vertical inversion by signaling the micro controller (In fig.1 elements 100 and 110) a circuit that obeys instruction to recognized active pixels (On LCD display element 130) of liquid crystal display to alter the sequence of presentation of data field(In fig.2 such as names and numbers of person or company), every time the micro controller receives signal from the button(In fig.1 elements 100 and 110).Lee does not show a caller identifier that capable to display having differentiated matrix for formation of characters in respective data fields for numbers minutes and dates.

Lim shows caller identifier that capable to display having differentiated matrix for formation of characters in respective data fields for numbers minutes and dates (in fig.6-

Art Unit: 2673

12 and In col.14 lines 25-67 to col.15 lines 1-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to allow the teaching of Lim's into portable display device of Lee's because it would have made a portable device in a more convenient for a user to see both ways such as upside down and still position with a user friendly manner.

3. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US2002/0180762 A1) in view of in view of Lim et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,067,355) in further view of Inoue et al., (U.S. patent No. 6,332,024).

As per claim 2,3 Neither Lee nor Lim shows display having telephone logo, envelope logo and manufacturing logo are inverted vertical inversion is carried out. Lee shows inverting display characters (In Fig.2). Inoue shows (in fig.13a –f) telephone logo, envelope logo and manufacturing logo. It would have been to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention was made to allow the incorporate the display elements such as logo of Inoue's into display combined system of lee's because it would have a portable matrix display with logo side by side or up side down character to see for a user or person.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's argument that image display has no change in display format is suggested by lee reference but it is not claimed in claim. And also argument about no manufacturing logo is appear, it also not claimed in claim1 and keeping the number of the incoming caller in the most visible place which is also not claimed in claim1. For reason not combined the Lee and Inoue reference and response to applicant's

Art Unit: 2673

argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness over Lee and Inoue reference, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Conclusion

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nitin Patel whose telephone number is 703-308-7024. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

Art Unit: 2673

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin H Shalwala can be reached on 703-305-4938. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NP August 8, 2004

Amare Mengistu